

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.: 2001P7462US

23

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed September 27, 2004. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of the Application. Claims 1, 9, 17, 27-30, 33, and 36 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and more distinctly claim inventive concepts previously present in these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by the amendments to the specification or by the amendments to the claims. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicant has responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-24, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,208,854 to Roberts et al. ("Roberts"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Roberts* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, the elements specifically recited in Applicant's claims. For example, *Roberts* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the combination of elements specifically recited in Claim 1, as amended:

- (1) establishing whether the first call forwarding destination and the second call forwarding destination refer to the same destination; and
- (2) if the first call forwarding destination and the second call forwarding destination do not refer to the same destination, changing at least one of the first call forwarding destination and the second call forwarding destination to yield the first call forwarding destination and the second call forwarding destination referring to the same destination.

Roberts discloses automatically routing a call to a called party's landline or wireless communication unit. According to *Roberts*:

When the calling party 210 places a call to the called party, the first computer readable program code 250 automatically determines the availability of the called party's wireless communication unit 230 (step 310). In response to the called party's wireless communication unit 230 being determined unavailable, the second computer readable program code 260 automatically routes the call to the called party's landline communication unit 220 (step 320). In response to the called party's wireless communication unit 230 being determined

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.: 2001P7462US

24

available, the third computer readable program code 270 automatically routes the call to the called party's wireless communication unit 230 (step 330).

(*Roberts*, column 2, lines 35-47; see also column 3, line 26-column 4, line 15.) That is, *Roberts* discloses automatically forwarding calls.

Roberts, however, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest synchronizing call forwarding destinations. Consequently, at a minimum, *Roberts* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "establishing whether the first call forwarding destination and the second call forwarding destination refer to the same destination," and "if the first call forwarding destination and the second call forwarding destination do not refer to the same destination, changing at least one of the first call forwarding destination and the second call forwarding destination to yield the first call forwarding destination and the second call forwarding destination referring to the same destination." For at least these reasons, *Roberts* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements specifically recited in independent Claim 1.

The dependent claims of Claim 1 are allowable based on their dependence on Claim 1 and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the reference of the rejection. Because Applicant believes he has amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claims over the reference of the rejection, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicant has not provided detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicant, however, remains ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1 and all claims that depend on Claim 1.

Independent Claims 9, 17, 27, 28, 30, 33, and 36 recite certain limitations substantially similar to those recited in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 9, 17, 27, 28, 30, 33, and 36, together with their dependent claims.

Section 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 25, 26, and 29-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Roberts* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,322 to Kimball ("Kimball") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,600,735 to Iwama et al. ("Iwama"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.: 2001P7462US

25

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of *Roberts*, *Kimball*, and *Iwama* as presented by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest elements specifically recited in Applicant's claims. As discussed above, *Roberts* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements specifically recited in the independent claims. Moreover, *Kimball* and *Iwama* fail to make up for the deficiencies of *Roberts*. Accordingly, the *Roberts-Kimball-Iwama* combination presented by the Examiner fails to disclose the elements specifically recited in the independent claims.

The dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claims and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the references of the rejection. Because Applicant believes he has amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claims over the references of the rejection, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicant has not provided detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicant, however, remains ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 25, 26, and 29-38.

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.: 2001P7462US

26

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179 of Siemens Information & Communications Products, L.L.C.

Date: Dec. 17, 2004

Respectfully requested,

CUSTOMER NUMBER 28524
SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

By: Thomas George
Thomas George
Registration No. 45,740
Attorney for Applicants
Tel: 650-694-5191
Fax: 650-968-4517